

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 were pending at the time of the Office Action. Claims 1-11, 16-29 and 34-36 were withdrawn from consideration. In this Amendment, claims 12 and 30 have been amended to clarify subject matter thereof. Support is found in pending claim 12. Care has been exercised not to introduce new matter. Claims 12-15 and 30-33 are currently pending for examination, of which claims 12 and 30 are independent.

The present Amendments to claims does not generate new issue or new matter because amendments to claims 12 and 30 add claim language already recited in claim 12.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.

Amendments to claim 12 clarify that steps of preparing the first RIP data, the second RIP data, the first plate-image-inspection RIP data, and the second plate-image-inspection RIP data are performed on the printing prepress system, by which the method of inspecting a print image in claims 12-15 is clearly tied to the printing prepress system. Because the claimed subject matter in claims 12-15 is clearly tied to a particular machine (a printing prepress system), the subject matter in those claims 12-15 should be patent eligible subject matter. *In re Bilski*, Case No. 07-1130 (Fed. Cir., 2008)

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 12-15 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

With regard to the Examiner's indication of lack of support in the specification for excluding correction after proofreading in claims 12 and 30, claims 12 and 30 have

been amended to clarify that the another prepress processing step is one of the sequential prepress processing steps to be done for a print image, but does **not include after client's proofreading of the first print image data**. Support is apparent in paragraphs [0072]-[0074] of the application-as-published, in which the signature/imposition processor 320 prepares preliminary proof RIP data RIPD2 by executing RIP processing on signature/imposition processed print image data PD2 without performing a proofreading of the RIP data RIPD1.

In view of the amendments to claims 12 and 30 and the above remarks, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 12 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Abstract and machine translation of Japanese Publication No. 10-154234 (Katsuya) in view of Date et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,473,748, hereinafter "Date") or Kitamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,894, hereinafter "Kitamura"). Claims 12-13 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuya in view of Date or Kitamura, as applied to claims 12 and 30 above, in view of Nahum (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0026457, hereinafter "Nahum"). Claims 14-15 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuya in view of Date or Kitamura, as applied to claims 12 and 30 above, and further in view of Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,798, "Nakagawa"). The rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The proposed combination of Katsuya, Kitamura, Nahum and Nakagawa fails to disclose limitations of claims 12 and 30 regarding "preparing, on the printing prepress

system, a second RIP data by executing RIP processing, in accordance with second RIP processing conditions that differ from the first RIP processing conditions, on a second print image data obtained by carrying out another prepress processing to the first print image data, the another prepress processing step being one of the sequential prepress processing steps excluding correction after client's proofreading."

Katsuya obtains the first latest version and the second latest version of raster type data by **performing proofreading on the latest page description data** and converting the proofread page description data into the raster type data. (See Abstract) In contrast, in subject matter of claims 12 and 30, a second RIP data is prepared by executing RIP processing, in accordance with second RIP processing conditions that differ from the first RIP processing conditions, on a second print image data obtained by carrying out another prepress processing to the first print image data and **the another prepress processing does not include correction steps via client's proofreading**. Support is apparent in paragraphs [0072]-[0074] of the application-as-published, in which the preflight processor 310 executes preflight processing on the original print image data PD0, and produces the print image data PD1, and prepares RIP data RIPD1 by RIP processing on the preflight processed print image data PD1. The signature/imposition processor 320 executes signature/imposition processing on the original print image data PD0 and produces the print image data PD2. The signature/imposition processor 320 prepares preliminary proof RIP data RIPD2 by executing RIP processing on signature/imposition processed print image data PD2.

In addition, Date and Kitamura which are cited for adding ornamental effects, Nahum, which was cited for converting images to a standard resolution, and Nakagawa,

which was cited for the plate inspection system, fail to cure deficiencies of claims 12 and 30.

Accordingly, claims 12 and 30 and claims dependent thereupon are patentable over combination of Katsuya, Kitamura, Nahum and Nakagawa, because the combination of Katsuya, Kitamura, Nahum and Nakagawa fails to disclose the limitations of claims 12 and 30 regarding “preparing, on the printing prepress system, a second RIP data by executing RIP processing, in accordance with second RIP processing conditions that differ from the first RIP processing conditions, on a second print image data obtained by carrying out another prepress processing to the first print image data, the another prepress processing step being one of the sequential prepress processing steps excluding correction after client’s proofreading.”

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

10/692,746

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Hosang Lee

Registration No. L00,295

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:HL:ldw
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 1, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**